

MARKED COPY

P 112

THE WATCHMAN EXAMINER

A National Baptist Paper

PROCLAMATION—BAPTIST YEAR OF JUBILEE, 1964

AS FRESH WINDS stir smoldering fire into flame, so God's Spirit swept through Baptist churches in North America one hundred and fifty years ago to stir Baptist people to a world encircling mission. Through two men, Luther Rice and Adoniram Judson, the Holy Spirit spoke to the churches.

Luther Rice was the apostle of united support for the missionaries. On horseback he forded streams, on foot he walked to frontier settlements, on ships he sailed to seacoast cities, persuading isolated and free-spirited Baptist churches that true freedom in Christ must be expressed in duties that are shared with others. This servant of God called the churches together in Philadelphia in 1814 to form the first national organization among Baptists of America, the General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions, to support missionaries and to act as a responsible national church body.

Adoniram Judson was the first evangelist of salvation in Jesus Christ from the new world to the Far East. He signalled the start of the stream of missionaries who have preached the Gospel of Jesus Christ and who have served people in His name on every continent.

To worthily celebrate the victories that Baptists of North America have enjoyed in their worldwide purpose to serve our Lord Jesus Christ, we have engaged for five years in a Baptist Jubilee Advance. We have listened anew to the word God is speaking to us in the Scriptures and in world events. We have sought to deepen our daily experience of life in Christ. We have engaged with new understanding in our ministry of witness in the world. We have invited many people to come and follow Christ. We have enjoyed Christian fellowship without barriers of race, nation, or denomination, looking toward the 150th anniversary year in 1964.

Therefore, we proclaim the year 1964 a Baptist Year of Jubilee among Baptists in North America, when we shall give thanks for the fellowship we share in the mission God has given us. We shall examine ourselves and confess and repent of those faults within us that cause the light of life to burn fitfully in this gusty world. We shall pray that the Holy Spirit, whose fire burned in Rice and Judson, may give us the light that will light every man in the world. We urge the Baptists of North America to join in the Jubilee Celebration in Atlantic City, New Jersey, May 22-24, 1964.

February 13, 1964

The Climate of Freedom

By Joseph Martin Dawson

Lessons drawn from the tragic assassination of President Kennedy in Texas.

IN THE AFTERMATH of the President's assassination it is certain that people in no American locality are more deeply troubled than Texans, and more particularly those in Dallas. Profoundest aspects of their anxiety are seen in two persistent questions that haunt them. First, how can freedoms—free speech, freedom of enterprise, academic freedom, political freedom—survive in the face of terrible ever-present risks? Then they ask that second question, to what extent do these dire risks arise from atmosphere or climate? But the nation, too, must make answer; hence this discussion is of concern to all.

Consider these questions against the background of Dallas and the state of Texas. On that fateful day of the President's assassination, friendly big Dallas put on its gala garments for the most gigantic parade of all its many past tributes to visitors, which have never been confined to football heroes, regional and remote men of renown and even to five former presidents of the United States, but whoever they were have been accorded the eminent in all categories. It remained for President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, accompanied by his lovely wife, Vice-President Lyndon B. Johnson, Governor John Connally and their charming wives, to receive the greatest ovation ever witnessed in the North Texas metropolis.

The Reaction in Dallas

When the diabolical shots suddenly interrupted this unprecedented manifestation of hospitality and good will, Dallas went into instant, concerted action to save the wounded and to apprehend the guilty. One policeman gave up his life in his effort to arrest the suspected fleeing assassin. Doctors and nurses worked with utmost skill and speed to avert death. All who could not personally aid, prayed. Alas, the President was dead and the Governor desperately maimed. There was so little that the people as a whole could do, it was maddening. After many weeks they are trying to find out what to do.

This is not a descriptive narration of events following the incredible assassination, but a serious confrontation of the two questions raised in this article at the outset, in relation to problems which affect the whole nation, compelling consideration.

Immediately after the assassination, some critics began sniping at Dallas, holding the city responsible. In the reigning excitement of the hour these critical shots were sparse and scarcely audible. As the veteran newsman, H. V. Kaltenborn, broadcast, "Everybody in the nation that commented said the right thing." So it seemed then, but the volume of reproach for Dallas has increased, also the sharpness of it, with constant accu-

sations of ugly acts by conservative extremists.

Meantime Dallas citizens failed to flare into a rage of resentment. Long lines of cars, causing a constant traffic jam, moved in awe past the assassination spot, many of them pausing to lay wreaths of flowers to which were attached cards with touching inscriptions on them. Schools were dismissed, business houses closed, churches held memorial services. Sorrow gripped the populace. Day after day the cars rolled by and in place of wilted flowers fresh ones piled up, with such words on them as, "God, forgive us all." And finally the city began planning a colossal enduring memorial to the lamented President, perhaps a beautiful colonnade beside a mirroring pool and a blaze burning, lit from the eternal flame ignited at the grave in Arlington Cemetery. Nothing has been decided as yet, but assuredly it will be a *magnus opus*.

As criticisms of Dallas have grown, so far as this outsider has observed, there have been few voices from within the city uplifted publicly to defend against them. Defense has come from an unexpected source, such as from the chaplain of the United States Senate, Dr. Fredrick Brown Harris.

The editor of the *Fort Worth Press* writes so intelligently that he deserves to be quoted:

If there are two hard hitting rivals in the country, they are Fort Worth and Dallas. But today we come to the defense of our neighbor. Dallas is a vibrant, strong, patriotic American city. And the good people who live there are being crucified. Dallas has its crackpots, its dissidents, its evil people. So have all our cities. And we in other cities well could have said when it happened, "There, but for the grace of God is our city." A blanket indictment of all the good people of Dallas, a calculated smearing of a city for the crime of one man, or two, is not in the spirit of this nation. Does not all our nation bear this scar and this shame? Does it not belong to us as much as to nearly one million people who live in Dallas, and its environs and now hurt so deeply and personally?

The citizens of Dallas might well reply to antagonists: "You reproach us for being rightists, but the accused, don't you see, was a radical leftist." Again they could say, "You talk about our 'atmosphere' or 'climate' as being conducive to violence, but the alleged killer was not spawned here; he only commuted here for the last two months to work for a textbook distributor; he borrowed no book from our public library; he was an alien and an enemy to our way of life." Still, again they could rightly say: "Dallas, long known as a moderate city, has a hundred-year record for striving after the excellent in civic affairs, in education, in literature, the arts and sciences, for institutions that serve community need." They could go on to urge, "Why did practically every religious denomination, decades ago, select Dallas for its state headquarters, thus adding numerous magazines to our publication lists and huge bookstores to our moral and cultural resources?"

True, Dallas has tolerated some extreme rightists and

[Dr. Joseph Martin Dawson has an excellent record of serving in Baptist pastorates and as general secretary for seven years of the Joint Committee on Public Affairs, representing six national Baptist bodies, and is also the author of several important books. He now resides at the Navarro Hotel, Corsicana, Texas.]

movements. It has also welcomed the NAACP and Civil Liberties Union. It accepted the court order for integration of Negroes into its public schools without disorders. A strong Citizen's World Council is active in constantly bringing discussions of vital topics before the people. It was this organization of 250 top executives which invited President Kennedy to speak in Dallas.

The extraordinarily progressive spirit of Dallas not only made the city the number one financial center of the entire South, but brought railroads, factories, airlines, universities, insurance companies, enormous hotels, vast oil stocks, the largest of all state fairs, but with them, as in most such immeasurable accumulations of wealth, a strong conservative tendency. With the rapid growth of this aggregation of financial interests, investors, executives, workers of all shades of political affiliation came in multitudes out of the North and East, indeed from all sections, so that suddenly it became apparent that this cosmopolitan center was no longer predominantly Democratic but actually Republican. It is possible that some Democrats interpret Republican opposition to a Democratic national administration as malignantly reactionary. I would be inclined to find fault with it because it may be rather more materialistic than violent as charged. But none will deny it is vocal.

To be sure, there have been at least two recent unseemly incidents definitely created by Dallas extreme rightists. Privately and officially these acts were repudiated, the guilty were duly arraigned, and the world informed that Dallas in no way approved of hatred or violence as exhibited by this small minority.

Control of Hysteria

The historian, Henry Steel Commager, says of violence on the right and left, that we are forced to view our free country of America as a violent country. The press researchers have uncovered the fact that we have had more assassinations of heads of state than any nation in the world. It adds up to something sinister, since it indicts every part of the country. We Texans shall have to concede that the Lone Star state has been notorious for its extremism. Certainly extremism ran rampant in pioneer days, was characteristic of our illustrious heroes like Sam Houston, James Bowie, Davy Crockett, Big Foot Wallace, and their like who also lived in the average frontier settlement. Some analysts insist that Texas history and traditions have inevitably made extremists of us all. It is not surprising, therefore, that under all the conditions as of now each one of us is loaded with a burden of guilt.

What to do under the circumstances does not come as a revelation to any. Methodist Bishop William C. Martin of Dallas sent a letter to his 86,000 constituents in which he advised: "This is no time for hysterical self-condemnation. It is a time to examine our lives in the light of Christ's teaching and example to see if there is any evil thought or purpose in us."

A veteran Associated Press newsmen interviewed leaders of Dallas with the result that every citizen, whatever his affiliation, showed that he felt all were on trial. Perhaps Mr. Joe M. Dealey expressed this as well as any when he spoke as president of the *Dallas Morning News*, a newspaper which fought the Ku Klux

Klan and has always condemned lynching and mob action: "If a man even suspected that he had contributed in any way to the assassination, no matter how indirectly, it would be a terribly sobering thing."

The Bishop's message had been impelled by a controversial sermon preached by a Dallas pastor under his jurisdiction. The pastor had been embarrassed by a national telecast out of New York which reported that the minister had said that children in a North Dallas public school had applauded upon hearing an announcement of the President's death. School authorities countered by saying that no school announcement of it had been made, they had heard no applause, but the children had heard of the death before they were dismissed. It might have been as in other cities when schools were dismissed little children are known to have clapped their hands, presumably over getting out.

Whatever really happened, seventy-five Methodist ministers upon hearing of their brother's embarrassment, without endorsing the contents of his sermon, voted unanimously in favor of a free pulpit and his right to utter his convictions. As a precaution against any possible violence erupting over the minister's incident the police guarded his home. As a matter of fact Superintendent W. T. White of the Dallas Public Schools reports that after thorough investigation it was found that only thirteen pupils out of 142,000 in the entire system betrayed any sign of disrespect for the President when learning of the murder, and these were earnestly dealt with.

It is believed that the Methodist body did right in upholding the policy of a free pulpit. The enemies of freedom usually strike down an unfettered pulpit first. The Communists did and the Fascists did. Religious liberty is basic to all freedoms. Of course, we take immense risks in maintaining a free pulpit, for preaching can be, and often is, the means of fanning the flames of fanaticism, the begetting of bigotry, and creating cruellest persecutions. But that mischief is the risk we take with all free speech, whether spoken or printed. In the instance of the Dallas preacher he might have been somewhat victimized by credulity in respect to rumor, but none can fail to commend his courage in upbraiding his own city for what he conceived as contributing to an atmosphere favorable to evil, for warning that we cannot make a scapegoat of a lone individual, for we are all bound up in the bundle of life together in human society and in a certain sense the guilt of the individual is the guilt of all.

There is another area where Texans have experienced enough anguish to learn that true freedom must not be tampered with, and that is the domain of the teacher. When the writer was connected with Baylor University, and World War I hysteria induced the Texas legislature to ban teaching of the German language from the public schools, an extremist invoked imprecations upon all things German. Dean J. L. Kesler, a graduate of the University of Berlin, who was presiding over the chapel audience on the occasion groaned and the over-wrought students booed their dean. That afternoon the local newspaper played up the incident and boldly charged that Baylor harbored a subversive. The frightened trustees convened hastily and fired the dean over the protests of President S. P. Brooks who asserted that Kesler was the best Christian he ever knew and losing

him would all but disrupt the university. It is difficult to envision a graver injustice done to any man.

To the credit of the Dallas school board, it must be noted that it restored a teacher who had been automatically suspended because of her infringing a standing rule against a teacher publicly expressing controversial views, thus conceding her right of dissent.

Not only must the preacher and the teacher be granted freedom but equally the editor. Nothing is more essential to the working of democracy than a free press. Here the risks taken are by far the greatest, but abide vital. Not always are publications exponents of public opinion, as proven by the oft-recurring spectacle of election areas where they circulate, which run adverse to editorial campaigning, but as a rule they reflect attitudes of their readers.

This power of the press to create climate is immensely desirable or infinitely deplorable according to the slant

of the reader. That it is a factor in freedom none will deny, but since it represents a cherished principle guaranteed by the Federal constitution, no true American wishes to suppress it. The remedy for any evil resulting from it lies in the many wholesome forces available in a healthy society. Such a society will assuredly try to preserve the democratic process, permit the utmost free discussion, and grant to every one his right of opinion without equating differences as hate, bigotry or intolerance. Most people know how sickly is mere conformity. Much as the churches wish brotherhood, they do not demand uniformity, for that can only be maintained by a dictator and even then is terribly dangerous, because it is liable to explode in rebellion at any moment. All the while the most orderly decent society is menaced by the unpredictable mentally ill and by lurking nihilists whose philosophy commits them to criminal violence.

God's Peace Corps

By Wesley P. Hustad

SHORTLY before the last presidential election Candidate Kennedy suggested to the people of the United States a dramatic undertaking. Spoking of the desperate and fast-multiplying needs of the peoples of the world, he proposed the organization of a small army of talented young men to work in the underdeveloped countries of the world as an alternative to military service. This group, he suggested, should carry the strategic name "Peace Corps."

In his proposal Mr. Kennedy said, "There is not enough money in all America to relieve the misery of the underdeveloped world in a giant and endless soup kitchen, but there is enough know-how and enough knowledgeable people to help these nations to help themselves." The idea was met by a great deal of skepticism! One writer envisioned "a great array of pony-tailed coeds and crew-cut Jack Armstrongs going out to play Albert Schweitzer—an appalling army of innocents abroad!"

Nonetheless, the idea caught the imagination of the nation, and today there are several thousand unofficial representatives carrying the meaning and message of America throughout the world on a people-to-people basis. And not all of them are young people. At least one is a retired American Baptist missionary, more than seventy years of age, but vigorous enough to serve humanity in the name of America.

It is not my prerogative nor purpose to evaluate this project, but rather to refresh our minds concerning the first and greatest Peace Corps of history. That one which was founded some 1900 years ago when the Incarnate Son of God, crucified, resurrected, and about to be raptured, said to his disciples: "Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Go ye therefore and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy

"Nothing can take the place of God's method of reconciliation."

Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Whenever and wherever his challenge has been accepted, the level of the earth's people has been immeasurably lifted—spiritually, morally and materially.

Motive of This Ministry

It is two-fold—having both negative and positive aspects. First of all in verse 11, "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men" (II Corinthians 5:11). As those who have escaped from behind the iron curtain of Communism are concerned about those who remain, so the one who has been rescued from the guilt and penalty of sin is concerned about those yet unredeemed.

"The terror of the Lord". This is a part of divine revelation that has not been emphasized in recent generations. Readers of church history will have cause to wonder if any but the Apostle Paul and Jonathan Edwards believed in it. What are the implications of this ominous-sounding phrase? At the very least it means that all those outside of Christ are without God and without hope in the world. There are those who affirm that such a motive is unworthy the calling of the Christian ministry. To whom we would answer: "Not any more so than the young man or woman who is drawn to the study and practice of medicine because of the reality of such dread diseases as cancer and leukemia. For both ministries are grounded in compassion and concern for fellow humanity—the one for his temporal and physical well being; the other for his eternal soul."

The positive motivation for this ministry is "For the love of Christ constraineth us . . ." The word "constraineth" is not one of common usage. It signifies the opposite of "restrain". So, if "restrain" means to hold back then "constrain" means to push forward. First of all, the love of Christ draws us to him. It is not an

[Rev. Wesley P. Hustad is pastor of Marshalltown Baptist church, Iowa.]